

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 10-12 have been amended. Claims 1-12 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mendolia et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,717,577, (hereinafter “Mendolia”). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, “at least one electrically conductive protrusion in electrical communication with the shielding portion and comprising a serrated edge for engaging with an inner surface of a conductive aperture in a circuit board to secure the shielding assembly to the circuit board”.

Mendolia, column 3, lines 23-24, describes “The shield can 210 includes guide pins 220 which extend through the printed circuit board apertures 130”, and at lines 41-43 “An electrically conductive path is created between the shield can 210, the gasket 240, the ground pad ring 110, and the ground plane 190”. Further, at column 4, lines 29-30, Mendolia teaches “the shield can 210 does not include guide pins 220 and the printed circuit board 100 contains no holes 130”.

Mendolia is completely silent with regard to a protrusion comprising a serrated edge for engaging with an inner surface of an aperture as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Mendolia.

Additionally, Mendolia is silent with regard to an “electrically conductive protrusion in electrical communication with the shielding portion”, as recited in claim 1.

To the contrary, Mendolia teaches a conduction path in which gasket 240 is in electrical communication with the shielding portion, as presented above. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom further patentably distinguish over Mendolia for these additional reasons.

With regard to claim 9, Mendolia is completely silent with regard to a protrusion configured to slant away from the shielding portion. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 9 further patentably distinguishes over Mendolia for this additional reason.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lonka et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,742,488, (hereinafter “Lonka”). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, “at least one electrically conductive protrusion in electrical communication with the shielding portion and comprising a serrated edge for engaging with an inner surface of a conductive aperture in a circuit board to secure the shielding assembly to the circuit board”.

Lonka, column 2, lines 21-23, describes “Each pin is generally conical or convex in shape and comprises a protrusion that forms an outwards protruding bulge on one side of the pin”. The pin 3 and bulge 4 are illustrated in FIG. 1A, and in cross section in FIG. 1C.

Lonka is completely silent with regard to a protrusion comprising a serrated edge as set forth in claim 1. The Office Action equates the protrusion of claim 1 with Lonka’s pin 3, but it is clear from Lonka’s description, presented above, as well as from examination of the cited figures that pin 3 does not include a serrated edge. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Lonka.

Further, with regard to claim 8, Lonka describes pin 3 as “generally conical or convex in shape”. Given this description, it is difficult to understand how the Office Action equates pin 3 to the “protrusion is substantially cylindrical”, as recited in claim 8. Therefore, the Applicants believe that claim 8 further patentably distinguishes over Lonka for this additional reason.

Claims 10-12 recite features, which are similar to those recited in claim 1, and are therefore, likewise believed to patentably distinguish over Lonka for the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681/71700.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin

Reg. No. 33,929

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 7-14-07